



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Canada in the Hundred Years' Peace.

BY JAMES L. TRYON.

The Assistant Secretary of the American Peace Society, Dr. James L. Tryon, will make a tour of Canadian clubs, universities and churches during the last two weeks of February, beginning at Hamilton and ending at Halifax. Among the important places that he expects to visit are Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, Fredericton, St. John, Sackville and Wolfville. His topics will be "The New Internationalism in the Schools and Colleges," "The Churches and the Peace Movement" and "The Hundred Years' Peace." The special object of this visit to Canada is to promote the century-of-peace celebration for which the American Peace Society has been working steadily through the press in the United States, Canada and Great Britain for the past six months.

The following article, which appeared originally in the *Christian Register*, is being reprinted by the Society in leaflet form with lists of books on Canadian history and literature furnished by Prof. J. G. Carter Troop of the University of Chicago and Mr. J. Arthur Favreau, secretary of the *Société Historique Franco-Américaine*, Boston:

"There is a magnificent feeling of fraternity behind the idea of celebrating our century of peace with Great Britain. The American, the Canadian and the son of Great Britain, whether he be an Englishman, an Irishman, or a Scotchman, were never such good friends as they are to-day. Each clings to his own nationality as the best for him; but each respects those peculiar features of custom, government and temperament that make the others distinctive.

"All three nations — for I call Canada one, although it is true to the British empire — have made sacrifices within the past century for the sake of peace. They have known what it is to bear and forbear as no other self-respecting countries in the world, and they have reaped the rewards of their moderation: they have become fast friends. Of the three countries, Canada has sacrificed most for the sake of peace. This has been due in part to her dependent position, as compared with the United States, and in part also to her regard for the peace and unity of the British empire, whose interests rather than Canada's have been the first consideration; but not to unworthy fear. And Canada is entitled to respect for every point of diplomacy that she has ever yielded. Out of her sacrifices has developed a conviction in her people of her international rights, among them the right of self-development and natural geographical expansion, such as will insure for her in time all the concessions that she deserves from Great Britain and from us.

"One of the things that has most impressed me in reading the history of Canada is this knowledge of herself and her good sense in biding her time. I read a few days ago the speech made by Sir John A. Macdonald in his own defense at the time when he was criticised for surrendering the interests of Canada in the negotiations relating to the treaty of Washington. It is an extraor-

dinary speech, such as every student of diplomacy should study as a masterpiece. It is without the sentiment of Chatham, the imagination of Burke and the eloquence of Webster, — it has no sonorous periods for the schoolboy to declaim; but for intelligent understanding of a complicated and delicate international situation, for far-seeing patriotism, sound sense and self-control, for a complete statement of facts, for prudential reasons for positions taken and for an appeal to the convictions, it is as impressive as it is possible for a speech to be. I speak of it because I believe it is prophetic of what is to be revealed to us when we come to know the political and diplomatic history of Canada, as we shall do when we prepare ourselves for the centennial of peace.

"We ought to begin to-day a careful study of Canadian history. We ought to avail ourselves of every opportunity to improve our relations with our northern neighbor. We see the benefits, in a more cordial understanding, of an exchange of professors between the United States and Germany; we know that we are doing and getting good by sending gifted lecturers like Bliss Perry and Archibald C. Coolidge to interpret America to Paris; we honor ourselves by studying Japan, whose history we have helped to make; and we recognize the duty of our educators and missionaries toward the reform movement in China; but first, nearest and dearest should be our relations with our brothers in Canada. We should know them as we know the people of our own States. We should become aware of the glories of the mighty nation whose foundations are being laid beside our own. We should study the system of responsible government in Canada, and we should learn about the federation that has been worked out there while we have been developing our commerce and dealing with our own constitutional problems here.

"We should know the story of Canada from the time that the American colonies became the United States. We should listen to the record of the heroic struggles of our brothers, the United Empire Loyalists, whom we as schoolboys were taught to call Tories and refugees, but of whose misfortunes and ill-usage at our fathers' hands we never had any conception. We could then begin to appreciate more than ever what it means to dare to have an opinion of one's own, what it is to build up a state on the virtues of hardship endured by other ancestors than ours. And, in recognition of this right to differ, we should give our neighbors, in sincere respect, the hand of fraternal greeting.

"We should know for what our French-Canadian fellow-citizens stand, and, with that broader mind that has come with a century of enlightenment, realize what we can all mean to each other if we will. We shall find the French-Canadian true to his sworn allegiance, whether British or American, a brave pioneer in the past, a worthy sharer in the political life and prosperity of two great countries to-day.

"I believe that the celebration, with all the preparation, historical, literary and practical, that will be incidental to it, will be the greatest event in the annals of world peace next to the Hague conferences, and that the lessons to be learned from it will make those conferences the more valuable in the future. It will impress the world with the principles of arbitration and the limitation of armaments, successfully tried for a hundred years. It will tend to solidify the English-speaking race. It

will enable all branches of that race to profit by its merits and its mistakes. It will increase the love of just liberty under law and the knowledge that liberty is the best bond of unity. It will encourage the cause of local self-government wherever men are fitted for it, and will enable us to see that they are fitted for it in places from which it is still wrongly withheld. It will show that local self-government has not been won without struggle, but that it may now be obtained without violence."

International Peace through Enlightened Self-Interest.

BY A. W. ALLEN.

It is safe to say that the civilized world desires international peace and would be glad to know that the days of warfare were ended. We need no stronger proof of this than the fact that governments, in demanding large armaments, are at constant pains to explain that they are required not to make war, but as an indispensable guarantee of peace.

But this desire, though plainly existent, is after all little more than a strong preference. Peace has never become a living issue, partly because it has been looked on as almost a Utopian dream and partly because the horrors of war, though recognized and admitted, have been regarded more or less philosophically as among the unavoidable evils, and mankind believes, as Prof. William James has expressed it in his essay on "The Moral Equivalent of War," that "there is nothing to make one indignant in the mere fact that man should toil and suffer pain." Suffering in war, indeed, is rated as a species of consecration, and, inhuman as it may seem, the enormous material cost—impossible to forecast—of a war between two great nations is to-day a stronger factor for peace than the suffering and death involved, which bears out, so far, the military claim that armaments constitute an insurance against war. How broad is this policy of insurance? Does it cover every contingency, or is it subject to conditions?

The relations between Russia and Japan preceding the recent war were not closely parallel to those now existing between the nations of Europe, but the outcome clearly demonstrates that, given sufficient cause of irritation, the most elaborate armaments on both sides do not invariably prevent a conflict—which is all we need to know. Fear of consequences will hold neither men nor nations in check beyond a certain point. If there is continued and increasing ill-blood, passion will in the end dominate fear, and one side or the other will strike regardless of results.

Within limits nations recognize one another's right to maintain a state of preparation against possible attack, and so long as this preparation is clearly for defense only it attracts no attention. But the instant one power takes a step that can be construed as disadvantageous to some other, suspicion is aroused and the threatened power promptly makes some counter move, setting in motion an endless series of checks and counter checks, the end of which, if no agreement can be reached, can scarcely fail to be war. The insupportable burden of increasing expense alone must sooner or later force an issue, demanding settlement in some form.

Presumably neither England nor Germany wishes for

war, yet both are following the path that leads to it. It is scarcely thinkable that mutual fear and suspicion could drive two of the greatest modern nations into a war which would have no purpose and for which there would be no rational excuse, but—and here is the vital point—if war is averted, it will almost certainly be because they reach some agreement, and not because of their armaments. Reasonable internal preparation for defense may be admitted as making for peace under present conditions; external aggressiveness points directly toward suspicion, misunderstanding and war.

If this reasoning is correct (and the strongest adherents of the insurance idea will scarcely claim that it will always prove effective), the very magnitude of the armaments considered necessary to prevent war will make it the more deadly, destructive and costly when it comes. War between two such nations as England and Germany, with powerful navies, vast resources and overweening national pride, would be a Titanic struggle, involving a fabulous material cost and a frightful toll in suffering and death.

Three points thus stand out saliently: that peace is desired, but not demanded; that the humanitarian argument is admitted, but not considered conclusive; that armaments may be as potent in provoking war as in promoting peace.

It seems clear that the existing international situation is fraught with peril, and that if lasting peace is to be realized, new forces must be enlisted to strengthen and augment those heretofore employed.

A great work has already been done. The peace workers of the past have proclaimed the cruelty and wickedness of war until the world has been forced to give them a hearing. They have been the pioneers, the dreamers if you will, the prophets of a great and beneficent movement; and their work is not yet done,—the evils of war and the blessings of peace must still be proclaimed. But more is needed. If an active sentiment for peace is to replace the present more or less apathetic attitude of the world, the appeal to humanity must be supplemented, through organized effort, by an appeal to enlightened self-interest.

We cannot here formulate a detailed plan of action. International work is for the most part new and must be more or less experimental. But there are already at least two established mediums through which to operate—the official Hague Conference, destined in time, perhaps, to become the World's Parliament, with power to bind the nations, and the Central Office of International Associations at Brussels, always available, whose purpose is to act as a clearing house for the national and international associations of the world, official and unofficial.

On the first medium it is unnecessary to dwell. It is doubtful if the world realizes the importance of what the Hague Conference has accomplished, but its work has been recorded and its purpose is known.

The second is an agency as yet comparatively unknown, in which the projectors desire to interest international workers in America, and which is now being studied here. World organization is not a new thought, but this, so far as known, is the first plan worked out to foster and guide it.

The Central Office of International Associations had its inception a year or two ago, as the outcome of the experience of some of Europe's most prominent international